UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/572,557	03/17/2006	Kaname Kawasugi	287593US0PCT	5072

22850 7590 08/25/2008

OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
1940 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER	
WEDDINGTON, KEVIN E	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1614	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/25/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

Claims 10 and 17-21 are presented for examination.

Applicant's response and declaration filed June 30, 2008 have been received and entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 10 and 17-21 are again rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meguro et al. (4,687,777), Hindley (5,002,953), France Patent (2,832,064), Momose et al. (6,251,926) and Yamasaki et al. (6,166,219) in view of Khaled (5,977,073) or Giordano et al. (6,660,298), all of record, for reasons of record as set forth in the previous Office action dated January 30, 2008 at pages 2-3 as applied to claims 10 and 17-21.

Applicant's declaration filed June 30, 2008 is not persuasive because the declaration only discusses each prior art references individually, and does not discuss the combination of the prior art references together to form the said instant composition.

Again, the instant rejection is based on the well established principle of patent law that no invention resides in combining 2 or more agents of known characters where the results obtained are no more than the additive effects of the individual agents. It has not been demonstrated on the record by mean of experimental data commensurate in scope with the claimed subject matter that applicant's combination produces any unobvious or unexpected results. The mere arguments of applicant are insufficient to overcome the strong prima facie case of obviousness without the experimental data.

Claims 10 and 17-21 are not allowed.